

our Nation. In fact, 41 million Americans right now have no health insurance. Many of them are Hispanics.

The Bush budget cuts funding for Medicaid coverage for children, low-income seniors and the disabled. The budget also eliminates funding for programs that increase the number of minority health care providers, desperately needed in communities like mine, where we need linguistically and culturally appropriate health care providers.

It is also important to note that the President's budget will only create 190,000 jobs this year, less than the number of jobs that we lost this February. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the U.S. economy lost 308,000 jobs this past month. Latinos are also particularly heavily impacted. In my own district, unemployment rates are far beyond the 9 percent, way above what the national level is at 5.6.

These unemployment rates are outrageous, and our President's solution to create only 190,000 jobs is not even nearly enough where we need to be. The President should focus his budget on funding important Federal programs that create opportunity or self-sufficient jobs for the 8.5 million unemployed Americans, and instead, the President's budget cuts job training and employment programs for dislocated workers. It fails to extend unemployment benefits for the 1 million Americans who cannot access Federal assistance, but are still jobless.

As bad as the President's budget is, I am even more disappointed by the budget that the Republicans want to offer, and the Republican budget resolution requires that almost every authorizing committee cut spending within its jurisdiction, and it fails to explain which programs those will be that will be on the chopping block. I think it is questionable that we somehow implement a 2.9 percent across-the-board cut in these programs without giving us specifics. In reality, what it means is there will be more cuts for veterans, our children and the elderly.

For example, the Republican budget fails to provide any specific funding for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. It provides only \$28 billion in new funding over 10 years for all the programs under the jurisdiction of two committees that are responsible for this, for Medicare, the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Energy and Commerce. From my own home district it would actually translate into \$233.2 million of cuts in Medicare over the next 10 years, and the State of California would lose more than \$18 billion.

Let us take a closer look at the Republican's budget and how it will impact education. Republicans, running on the assumption that every program harbors substantial waste and fraud, are requesting the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut out \$10 million from their budget. So what is it going to be, school lunch programs for kids or student loans?

We need to be responsible in our budget deliberations.

□ 1930

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Attending Physician of the House of Representatives:

U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have determined that the grand jury subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

DR. JOHN EISOLD,  
*Attending Physician.*

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, HUMAN RESOURCES, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Kathy A. Wyszynski, Associate Administrator, Human Resources, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 17, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that the Office of Payroll and Benefits has been served with a subpoena duces tecum issued by the Superior Court of San Bernardino County, California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KATHY A. WYSZYNSKI,  
*Associate Administrator, Human Resources.*

#### RESPONSIBILITIES IN WAR AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, Members who were not here during the first Persian Gulf War, the next few days will probably be some of the most serious time that we have served in the House. The consequences of the action of our Nation will be consequences that will go down in history. I think it is a good

time this evening for us to sit back and take a look at what are our responsibilities.

What are our responsibilities as Republicans? What are our responsibilities as Democrats? On what issues should we act in a bipartisan fashion? On what issues should we go out and be willing to stand up for the issues, for the very standards that this country stands for? I think in the next 48 hours or so, our country, it is pretty obvious, will engage in a military conflict; and I think it is for the right reasons.

President Bush's speech last night was simple, not a lot of fancy language. It was straightforward. He did not mince any words; but more than anything else, it was appropriate. It spoke of the responsibility of the Commander in Chief. It spoke of the responsibility of the United States of America. It spoke of the responsibility of the allies and the willing coalition that has the gumption, has the foresight to stand up to one of the most vicious men and one of the most vicious regimes in the history of the world. It is time for us to stand united.

When we speak about responsibility, let us talk about what another President thought about responsibility. Let us talk about Bill Clinton, the former President of the United States. He recognized, and whatever issues Members have with Bill Clinton, he recognized what Iraq was about and what Saddam Hussein was about. Unfortunately, in the last few days I think the former President has violated kind of an unspoken rule and that is past Presidents do not interfere or try to interfere or play politics on foreign matters especially at a time of war. But President Clinton and, of course, former President Jimmy Carter have decided to speak out.

But I want to relate to Members and show exactly what President Clinton recognized; he recognized what the responsibility of this Nation was against the horrible regime of Saddam Hussein. This is what Bill Clinton said about it on February 18, 1998. President Clinton on Saddam Hussein and Saddam's threat: "What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him yet more opportunities to develop his program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made? Well, he will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude he can go right on and build an arsenal of devastation and destruction." Bill Clinton 1998.

That President recognized the responsibility of this country, and President Bush and his team at the White House have correctly recognized and stood up for the responsibility of this country and our willing allies. I want to talk about what are the responsibilities of the United Nations; what can the United Nations do and what should we expect from the United Nations; and

what can they not do or what would be defined as an overexpectation of the capabilities of the United Nations.

Let me say first of all, we have to look at the structure of the United Nations to understand why, when it comes to standing up militarily or taking a tough police action which involves military engagement, we can see why the United Nations the way it is structured cannot possibly come to an agreement on how to do that. They could not come to an agreement in Kosovo where we had clear and resounding agreement on Slobodan Milosevic. They could not come to an agreement on the Cold War or on Somalia. The United Nations, time after time when we take a look at particular actions that require military engagement, the United Nations cannot come to a decision. Why can they not come to a decision? Because of the makeup of the United Nations.

The United Nations has 192 separate countries. The United Nations has chosen to put Libya as head of the Human Rights Commission; and they actually had Iraq to chair the U.N. conference on disarmament. Mr. Speaker, Iraq was chairing the United Nations conference on disarmament. How can we expect much more from the United Nations. The United Nations has failed to act.

The United States and its willing coalition has stood up to its responsibilities. The United Nations, unfortunately, was bulled over, as they always are, in my opinion, in part by the French. And the French, the only success that I have seen in the last month or 6 months or 12 years, frankly, the only success I have seen from the French and the Germans and the Belgians is to successfully isolate themselves.

It is interesting to think that the members of the United Nations like North Korea, Libya, Iraq and Iran consider the French their ally. Who could have ever imagined, who could have ever imagined that the French, the perception out there in the country of renegade nations, that those nations would recognize France as their ally?

We all grew up with the understanding that the French were a democratic society, a society that stood strong with the United States, although the French never really led the battle. Keep in mind in World War II, it was the French, and frankly when we look at it, take a look at where they were. It was the French that adopted the constant policy negotiate, negotiate, negotiate, talk, talk, talk. In World War II some of these countries in Europe wanted to do everything they could to get rid of Adolph Hitler, except for one thing. They did not want to fight him. They did not want to take him head on.

But back to the United Nations. How can the United Nations function when it is 192 separate countries from 192 different economic levels from a variety of different types of governments within those countries, whether it is de-

mocracy, communism, socialism, dictatorship or run by a bunch of thugs like we saw in Somalia? Those 192 different countries have different economic levels and cultural environments that they have adopted over the years, and different treatments of human rights. Take a look at the treatment of women in Iraq or the treatment of children in Iraq and the so-called theory of education in Iraq, and the starvation and prejudice that we see in North Korea; but yet all of those countries are standing members of the United Nations, and I am being told that we can expect the United Nations to come together on an issue of serious consequences such as the engagement of a military conflict? We can understand why it has taken the United Nations 12 years to reach a decision that they cannot reach a decision. The United Nations is in fact on military engagement a paper tiger.

Does the United Nations have an appropriate location and what is their responsibility? One, their responsibility right now at the very beginning, and the responsibility of the French and the responsibility of the Germans and the responsibility of the Belgians, they should all adopt resolutions supporting the troops of the willing coalition. They should all put out a resolution supporting a regime change of Saddam Hussein. The door has closed on the so-called diplomatic relations as stated by the President.

If the Germans and French want to continue what I think were good allies or at least an alliance that withstood a lot of pressures through the years, they need to come out and support the Americans troops and the troops of their neighbors, the troops of Spain and Italy and the British troops. The French, the Germans, and the Belgians need not go any further to be identified as allies of North Korea, as allies of Libya, as allies of the regime in Iraq, and as allies of Iran. They need to distinguish themselves, and all they have done in the last several months is to isolate themselves in a corner with those rogue countries.

We have had the debate and discussions. We are going to engage in a military conflict, barring some miracle in the next 24 hours. The French, it is time for our allies to stand up. We are not asking for much, they would not give us much, but they at least ought to stand up and support the American troops, and that is the responsibility I think; and I am not asking too much of those allies who I feel this time around, as in the past, have let us down.

But going back to the United Nations, where does the United Nations fit in this puzzle? How can the United Nations be an effective institution? I think they can be an effective institution as long as we focus very narrowly on the responsibilities. Again coming back to the responsibilities, one, responsibilities that they can handle; and, two, responsibilities that they can effectively carry out.

As I have made clear in my statements, the United Nations cannot effectively handle nor can they come to any kind of decision when it comes to military conflict in the world. They just do not have the structure to do it. We cannot have 192 nations with that kind of diversity with those different kinds of governments come to an agreement.

But the United Nations can play a role. What role do I see them play? I see the United Nations as a social institution, as an institution that can probably effectively deliver food to starving countries such as Ethiopia, maybe even help under certain circumstances to deliver what human aid they can to North Korea, what human aid will not go straight to the military, what will go to the people.

I see the United Nations as a social institution which can help facilitate and lead the world's fight against AIDS, and be a leader against breast cancer and prostate cancer and health in general. I think they can be effective in those areas. But it is a huge mistake, and it has been proven in the last several weeks, for us to assume that the United Nations can really play an effective role in standing down a regime like Saddam Hussein.

To me the United Nations is kind of like Chamberlain was in 1938 with Hitler. I have a well-written article, and let me give credit to the author, Alistair Cook. Throughout the ceaseless tide, there was a voice of an old man, Prime Minister Chamberlain, saying instead of taking on Hitler, I believe it is peace for our time. When he made that statement, instead of going to war to stop Hitler from taking Czechoslovakia and other countries, he said, I believe it is time for the peace of our time.

□ 1945

The entire House of Commons applauded. They stood up. They gave him a standing ovation. Only one old grumpy man in the back of the room said much of anything, and he said, "I believe we've suffered a total and unmitigated defeat when we look at somebody like Hitler and say it is, Peace for our time. Appease him." That grumpy old man happened to be a guy named Churchill. The scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 with the British Prime Minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler, the appeasement. The rest of it, within months, Hitler went ahead and walked into it and conquered it. "Oh, dear," said Mr. Chamberlain, "he has betrayed my trust. Oh, my gosh, Hitler has betrayed my trust."

What do you think you are dealing with when you are dealing with a Saddam Hussein? That is why in my opinion the United Nations really, I think, have tremendously weakened themselves. I do not see any circumstances whatsoever. I mean, we have a history of 12 years of the United Nations, and I have got a poster over there that shows

resolution after resolution after resolution after resolution, appeasement after appeasement after appeasement after appeasement. And where has it gotten us? It has not gotten us anywhere. Frankly, I think, in fact, it has gotten us into a war.

I think if the United Nations would have taken just their first resolution and followed through with what they said they were going to do, if they would have put inspectors in there that really meant something, if they would have enforced that, we could have done it diplomatically. The United Nations probably could have done it during that period of time diplomatically. But instead they adopted the doctrine of appeasement. They adopted the doctrine of the French. Negotiate, negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. Do whatever you can to get rid of the problem except fight it.

The policy that was adopted by the United Nations, the policy that has been adopted by the French and the Germans and the Belgians is the policy of going to the cancer doctor, and when he tells you that you have cancer, you say, "Doctor, I don't want to believe it. I'm going to go out of this room and hope I can talk to some friends about what a horrible thing it is, and it's going to go away on itself. Don't talk to me about cutting my foot off, Doctor. There's got to be some other way to handle this cancer, maybe some warm talk or maybe prayer." Prayer helps, by the way, but it usually does not get rid of the cancer. "Maybe there is some other alternative other than going in there under the knife, Doc, to attack this cancer."

The fact is that had you attacked the cancer when you first went to the doctor, the next time you go to the doctor, it probably would not be all over your body. The fact that here in the United Nations, had the United Nations not let the world down, had the French and the Germans been as insistent on the United Nations enforcing their first resolution as they are insistent on the United States and its allies not enforcing 1441, the 16th or 17th resolution, we would not be here today. We would not have a war.

It amazes me that the French stand out to the world as the peacemakers of the world, as if they are the Chamberlains. Where were they in 1993 and 1994 and 1995 and 1997? By the way, those were years that Saddam Hussein was using mustard gas, nerve gas and anthrax against his own population. Where were the French? Where were the Germans?

I honestly think we could have avoided war today had we tackled that cancer back then, but they did not do it.

The United Nations has, as the President says in dealing with the French, the United Nations has played their hand. They are not fit. They are not structurally designed to do this. They do not have the gumption or the leadership to do this. They cannot get the votes to do this. They are not a mili-

tary institution. They are not an institution that can issue resolutions and then back it with discipline.

It is kind of like going to school. I knew some teachers that became principals. They were not successful as principals. They were great teachers. In fact, in most cases they were too nice to be a principal. They could not bring it upon themselves, one, to discipline other teachers, and they could not bring it upon themselves, even though we were friends with the principal, we knew we got away with misbehavior because the principal was too nice, he just could not bring it upon himself in this particular case to discipline us. We read that like a clock, just like a clock.

Saddam Hussein can read the United Nations like a clock. It is not complicated, by the way. You figure it out pretty soon. It is like going to the cookie jar. You find out pretty soon whether you are going to get in trouble or not for getting your hand in the cookie jar. If you are not in trouble, you tend to find your hand going to the cookie jar a little more frequently.

I think the United Nations unfortunately, or maybe fortunately, now that I think about that, maybe it is good that this has occurred so we really can figure out what focus the United Nations should take. Maybe it is good in that we can understand, look, we have overassigned the United Nations, we have expected too much from a structure that simply cannot handle the responsibility that is handed to it. With that vision, I think once we resolve this situation in Iraq, there will be other problems. There is going to be the North Koreans. There is going to be the Iranians. There are other problems out there. But I think we are best, I guess, situated or to our advantage to approach those problems understanding that the United Nations really should not be the vehicle, the wagon that we put all our gear in and expect the United Nations' horses to be able to pull that wagon up the hill. They cannot do it.

But as I said earlier, there is an appropriate spot for them, to help us in the worldwide fight on AIDS, the worldwide fight on starvation, to help education throughout the world. Those are passive, social science issues that are very, very important to the international community and very, very important, whether my colleagues are Republicans or Democrats, very, very important for the whole world. Our Nation can help in that, but I think the United Nations is appropriate in that location.

I want to switch from the United Nations. I think I have made it pretty clear. I think they have dropped the ball on this. I think it was the Wall Street Journal today, and I may even have a copy of an editorial out of the Wall Street Journal. They are right. The Wall Street Journal said today, "The fighting will likely soon commence, but it is not in fact the start of

this war. It is the beginning of the end of the war that began when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait on August 2, 1990."

Keep in mind that the reason Saddam Hussein remained in power is not because Bush, Sr., did not want to go into Baghdad, it is because Bush, Sr., frankly listened to the advice and the demand from the United Nations that the regime be left standing; that the only mission out there was to free Kuwait, to push Iraq out of Kuwait, but to leave Saddam. We could not go into Baghdad. People blame the Vice President, DICK CHENEY, whom I think is one of the outstanding leaders of this Nation. People say, "Why didn't you guys kill him 10 years ago?" It is because we listened to the United Nations, and the United Nations insisted, demanded that the United States not go in and kill Saddam Hussein. That was the United Nations. Just another example. They cannot do it.

I am critical of the United Nations, but I also understand. It is kind of like getting mad at a child. You know they misbehaved, but you have also got to look at all the circumstances around it. Does that child have some reason that they cannot behave, that they cannot really control? It is the same thing with the United Nations, structurally the way it is built. You think North Korea? You think Iraq who is head of the disarmament convention, or you think Libya which the United Nations just installed as the head of the Human Rights Commission are going to come to some kind of agreement to restore human rights, for example, in any country in the world?

Let me move off the United Nations and talk about something else. I have heard time and time again, in fact, I was surprised, over the weekend, time and time again I heard commentators who know better talking about the United States' war against Iraq, the United States' effort against Saddam Hussein. The United States. I have heard this so often, it almost makes me ill. The United States acting alone. I used to be a police officer. Somebody asked me the other day, my friend, Fred Cheney, "What is it you took out of your police career? What is it that you took that was the most benefit to you being a police officer?"

I said, "I can't tell you how many times I rolled up to the scene of an accident or rolled up to the scene of a crime, made an assumption as to what happened there only to find out later I was completely wrong once we looked at all the facts." I guess the best case is the Smart case in Utah. Take a look at that. Everybody probably assumed that the deceased suspect was the one who kidnapped her. They found stolen goods in his car, everything pointed to him, so it must be him. Once the facts are looked at more carefully and more carefully, we find out, in fact, that he was an innocent man.

It is the same kind of thing here. Before these journalists start making the

statement that the United States goes it alone, or they somehow downplay the fact that the Brits, Tony Blair, who stands up as a profile in courage, they downplay the courage that he has shown, they downplay the United Kingdom as if it is not much of a country, and so the fact that they are joining the United States really is not of much substance because, after all, who is the United Kingdom? The responsibilities, again coming back to that word responsibilities, the responsibilities of the national media and the worldwide media are to look at the facts.

Let me show you the facts on the coalition, the willing coalition, as President Bush puts it. To my left are the member countries that are joining the United States, joining the United Kingdom, joining the Spanish, joining the Italians, joining the Turks, joining the Polish, joining the Hungarians. Look at all of these countries. These countries, even Poland, the Polish are sending 200 troops into this action. You tell me that any of those commentators that talk about the U.S. going it alone or the U.S. and the Brits going it alone, this does not take a lot of intellectual ability to figure out what this coalition is. You can pull this list right off the Internet. Take a look at these countries that are supporting us in our effort. Denmark, Afghanistan. I will just jump around. Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Rumania, Turkey, Slovakia, Philippines, Macedonia, South Korea, Iceland, Ethiopia, El Salvador, Colombia, Albania, Australia, they are sending forces in there, Czech Republic, Georgia, Italy, I talked about Italy earlier, the Netherlands, Poland, I talked about them, Spain. This is what that coalition looks like, and the momentum is building by the day. The momentum is building by the day.

Why are these countries doing it? Because they understand the word "responsibility." We cannot afford to shirk our responsibility. We cannot walk away from this fight. This is a cancer you cannot walk away from and hope it is better tomorrow. This is a cancer that you cannot go away and say, if I sleep on it and wake up tomorrow, it is actually going to recede. That cancer is going to go in remission because I simply sleep on it and give it a little time. Give cancer a little time, and it will go backwards. It will go into remission. That is not what happens. You have to reach out and attack it.

I was at a town meeting not too long ago, actually a group meeting, not an official town meeting. Somebody said, the United States, what is our responsibility as a government to protect this government from terrorism, and are they tied together? I said, of course they are tied together. A lot of these people feed from the same trough, frankly. They have the same coffee together. Of course it is tied together. But the fact is in order for us to protect, we cannot have security at every mall in America. We cannot have armored guards and meters and check-

points when you go to some theater somewhere, you go to a mall, you go to a restaurant somewhere in this country, you go to a football game, a high school football game.

The fact is our responsibility, and frankly, Democrats, it falls on you as well, but our responsibility is to reach out. We cannot defend this country completely. We have got to go out and attack the terrorists, in their field. We cannot sit, and every country in this list to my left understands, you cannot sit and let that cancer grow. We have let Saddam Hussein flaunt his weapons, flaunt the United Nations, flaunt the international community for over 12 years and many, many resolutions.

By the way, I find it somewhat appalling when we talk about responsibility. I listened over the weekend, and I am not trying to be partisan here, but I am talking about facts. Howard Dean stands in front of the Democrats at their convention in California. They give him a standing ovation as he blasts the leadership of this country, as he blasts this antiwar stance. My response to Howard Dean, my response to Martin Sheen, my response to Sheryl Crow and my response to some of these other people is, don't walk away from the cancer. You better figure out how you are going to handle this thing. It will not go into remission on its own.

Frankly, these countries have come together in a willing coalition to do whatever is necessary to take care of the threat that Saddam Hussein has. I think this coalition will come close to the size of the coalition that we had in the first Persian Gulf War.

My particular point here is when you listen to the media, understand clearly, it is not the United States acting alone. It is not the United Kingdom acting alone. It is a coalition of the willing.

I give a lot of credit to our President. I think he has done an admirable job. Anybody that thinks they would like to have his job, look at what he faced in his first term. He comes into an economy that is going south on him. We had two down quarters before he even came into office. He has got an economy that seems to barely be hanging on. He loses a space shuttle on a weekend. He has got the problem with the Middle East, with the Palestinians and the Jewish community fighting. We have got this situation with Iraq. We have got the situation with North Korea. He had the international incident with the Chinese when they went on the aircraft equipment. That is a full-time job. These people that criticize it, I find it interesting that people like Martin Sheen, who has probably had all of 5 minutes' education on foreign affairs and certainly, certainly is not able to access any classified briefings at all that we get or any kind of knowledge on the subject, criticizes our President, has spent, many, many, many times more, same with Howard Dean, criticizing our President than they have Saddam Hussein.

□ 2000

Where is the responsibility? I think it is a freedom, a part of democracy, that we stand up and voice our opinion. I absolutely agree with that. But at some point, it does become unpatriotic.

And let me issue a challenge right now to my colleagues on the Democratic side because frankly I have not heard it on the Republican side, but I am pointing to some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, to Howard Dean, to Martin Sheen, to Sheryl Crow, to some of these movie stars out there that have become all of a sudden experts. Although they are wonderful actresses and actors, they have become experts in foreign affairs, they do become unpatriotic. And mark my words here. They do become unpatriotic when this action begins if they do not support the troops of the United States of America and its allies. They ought to throw that sign they have been carrying or those T-shirts they have been wearing or, in Sheryl Crow's case, that guitar band she likes to wear around; and they ought to throw that in the trash and replace it, Sheryl Crow, with a band that says "I support the troops of the United States of America." And if they cannot find it upon themselves to do that, in my opinion, they have in fact crossed that line from patriotism. Regardless of how they debate the issue, they can still be patriotic. They have crossed that line to be unpatriotic. They have shirked their responsibility. They have dropped their responsibility to this great country.

George W. Bush has done a good job. DICK CHENEY has done a spectacular job. The President leading this team, putting this team together. How could we have been so lucky as to find somebody like Condoleezza Rice? Take a look at Colin Powell. Take a look at Rumsfeld. Take a look at that team. We have got the A-team down there on Pennsylvania Avenue. We have got a team that most countries only dream of; and we have got a team that when it has come time to stand up and accept the responsibility, they do it. And this Congress, frankly, and to the credit on both sides of the aisle, we did it in a bipartisan vote. Although we had some dissent and we heard some very harsh language, especially at the Democratic convention in California, the fact is most of the Democrats and all of the Republicans stood up and supported this.

We are standing up to our responsibility, and it is not the United States going alone. These countries in their own way, even if it is only 200 troops from Poland, in their own way with the resources they have, they have stood up. They stood to be counted, and counted they will be. And every one of these people, the contribution they make to this effort, even as small as it may seem to others, it is big to them; and, frankly, in the overall picture it is very, very important. When we fight a cancer, we had better take all the assistance we can get from every friend we can find.

That is the only way we are going to conquer it. And I want them to know I appreciate it, and any of my colleagues here who have family over there, come from these countries, know people, the next time they see somebody or the ambassador or one of their representatives or just a citizen from this country, they ought to tell them thanks. Not thanks that they came to the assistance of the United States of America, but they ought to thank them for standing up to the responsibility that the entire world ought to be standing up to, that they are filling the void that the United Nations could not stand up to, that they are taking on the issue head-on for the good of their country and for the good of the rest of the world. They are not doing it as a favor to the United States or as a favor to the United Kingdom. They are doing it as an obligation of responsibility to this fine world that we live in.

Now I want to talk about our forces. I am so proud of those young men and women, and not only the young men and women right now that are on the desert floor waiting for the final order, not only the men and women that have now actually instituted in one way or another the beginning of the military action, but also the young men and women, and not just young, by the way, but the men and women of our military forces that are stateside as well. Keep in mind it takes a lot of logistics. It takes a lot of men and women to prepare all of the things.

I was talking to somebody yesterday. I said, just imagine, we have got 250,000 troops out there. Somebody in the United States has to figure out about every other week how to get 250,000 tubes of toothpaste to these people, 250,000 meals times three or probably four a day considering the energy that they are using, how to get the fuel to the trucks. This is a nationwide effort by a lot of citizens of the United States.

I taught a class in Montrose, California, yesterday. I had a young man ask me, and I hear this question quite often, "Are we ever going to see the draft again?" And I think this action that we see today illustrates why the draft will not work. Why will it not work? I said to this young man, "What do you want to be?" He wanted to be a songwriter. Frankly, I think the kid probably will be a songwriter one of these days and probably a pretty good one, but he wanted to be a songwriter. I said, "How would you like to have graduated from college in music, beginning your songwriting career, and the United States Government calls you up and says, 'One, we are not only going to put you in the military but instead of going to the Army band, for example, you are going to be washing trucks or doing something that you cannot stand. We are forcing you to do it and you are going to have to give up 2 years of your life?'"

What we have today is not a force at all like that. Today our force, regard-

less of the branch of the military, is an all-volunteer force, and our morale is the highest it has been in decades. Our people are serving this country because they want to serve this country; and I know that by far the majority, not all of us on this floor, but the majority of us support these troops 100 percent. And I am embarrassed and I am going to be really embarrassed and angered, by the way, if people like Martin Sheen cannot, and the debate is over, Martin, and Sheryl Crow, who, by the way, a lot of us country music listeners like, and the Dixie Chicks kind of stepped on their own toe last week too, put it aside and support the troops.

Put down the signs, protesters, that are giving more credit to Saddam Hussein and have expressed more hatred towards their own President than they do one the most vicious men in the history of the world, the worst murderer, by the way, who killed more Muslims than any other man in the history of the world. Put down the signs that are supporting him and trashing our own President. Put those signs down and pick up a sign that says to the troops of the United States of America "We are behind you. You are our people, you are our boys, you are our men and women and we support you." Regardless where we stand on the issue of the war, whether or not we like the United Nations or do not like the United Nations, whether or not we like SCOTT MCINNIS or do not like him, whether or not we like the President or do not like the President, the fact is the time has come for every so-called peace protester, although I happen to think the way we secure peace is to make sure we do not let Saddam Hussein out there, the way you stop cancer is to attack it, not to ignore it. But all out there who have carried those signs, I challenge you, and colleagues of mine here on the floor, I challenge each and every one of you to pick up a sign or make a sign tonight that says "We support the troops of the United States of America," whatever those troops need.

Tomorrow many of us will go on with our daily routine, but the real sacrifice is going to be carried by several hundred thousand of our people in the military forces and civilian employees that support them; and we ought to at least take a little time in our day, regardless again of where we stand on the issue, to say thanks, to pat those people on the back and to give them every prayer we can possibly give them, to give them every thought of hope we can give them. Our government and our President and this administration as previous administrations have provided them with the weapons and the assets. We have given them everything they can get out there. But what will get them over the hump, what they really need the most is to know that people at home support them.

Martin Sheen, what do you think it says to our military forces or to those Democrats that stood and applauded at the Democratic convention in Cali-

fornia this week, the anti-war attitude of that party, what kind of message do you think it sends over to these people? Put it aside. Stop. Put it aside. And just for a while come out here and help send a word of praise, a word of encouragement, a "go get them" to our forces that, by the way, are the ones that will really make the sacrifice. Most people tomorrow in this country will go to McDonald's; they will go to the grocery store. Their life pretty well will run on pattern, but in the next 2 or 3 days, hopefully not very many but we have to expect there will be some deaths in this engagement and the next few days those people will be sacrificing, and they at least ought to know that the people of America unanimously, not part of the people, but the people of America unanimously support the troops of the United States of America.

Let me move on to another subject that I think is awfully important. I have several times during my comments talked about Saddam Hussein and his vicious regime; and let us not kid ourselves, his sons are as deadly as he is; and I want to just read some of the firsthand experience. A lot of people have come up to me and said, How do you know he is such a vicious guy? That is what some people say. How do you know he has these weapons of mass destruction? For two reasons: One, we have got the proof of the horrible things he has done; and, two, the fact that these weapons that he now says he did not have, he said he did have. But I want to read this comment, and this is from an Iraqi expatriate. The reality of Saddam's Iraq.

This is not a Martin Sheen. This is not a Sheryl Crow. This is not Howard Dean, the ex-Governor of Vermont talking. Those people have never been there. In fact I would bet that Sheryl Crow, Martin Sheen, the Dixie Chicks, some of these people like that have never felt hardship, have never felt hardship like the person that I am talking about. My guess is they have never been on a foreign visit other than playing in a concert somewhere or playing in a movie somewhere. My guess is they have never been on the ground firsthand to witness what this person talks about.

Let us read it: "You will be hardpressed to find a single family in Iraq which has not had a son, a father, or a brother killed, imprisoned, tortured, or disappeared due to Saddam's regime." And I note here not just Saddam but Saddam's regime. The majority of Iraqis inside and outside Iraq support the invasion action because they believe they are the ones that have to live as things are. They believe they are the ones that have to live as things are.

The President, in his speech last night, very accurately said we will liberate the people of Iraq. There are a lot of people like the Martin Sheens and the Sheryl Crows and people like that in the world that are protesting in our own country that have no idea how oppressed those people are. They have no

idea how happy those people will be when they see American forces.

Take a look at Afghanistan 2 years ago and take a look at Afghanistan today, the liberation that took place there. Take a look at the people in the villages running up and hugging the soldiers, people offering the soldiers food, applauding them, cheering them. Take a look at Iraq a year from today. As a challenge, take a look at that, where the people will be a year from today versus the oppression that they are under today under this regime. Do my colleagues think we would have gotten there through negotiations with the United Nations? Do my colleagues think we would have gotten there with the French or the Germans or the Belgians that love to negotiate and talk and have coffee and negotiate and talk and have coffee and negotiate and talk and have coffee? No way. They have tried it for 12 years. The Wall Street Journal said very accurately this war started 12 years ago. It is not beginning in the next few days. It started 12 years ago.

And, finally, there is a coalition of countries throughout this world that are willing to stand up and liberate the people that have faced this kind of oppression. Name one other leader in the world that has used mustard gas or nerve gas to wipe out between 5,000 and 50,000 of his own citizens.

I was corrected. Remember Kent State years ago in the Vietnam War and the protests and this country's armed forces, I think it was the National Guard shot, I think, four students at Kent State and the country was outraged. How could a Nation's military kill four people of its own? And yet the very people that I am sure would have been leading the protest, objecting to that kind of action, are the very people that unfortunately, tragically, incorrectly stand by silently as this population of people suffer from the regime of Saddam Hussein.

□ 2015

I am pleased to say that our fine President, our President and this administration and this Congress and this country, is not going to allow that to go on for very many more hours. I did not say years.

I cannot tell you how proud I am to stand here and look to the next generation behind us, to my kids, to the young people, to the people that we serve, and say we are about to end a regime within the next few hours, the next couple of days at the most, 3 days, but certainly within hours. The country of Iraq will be liberated from one of the most horrific animals, one of the most vicious men ever known to mankind.

I wish some of you that were carrying those protest signs, and I wish some of you who had been so vehemently opposed to George W. Bush, personally attacking our President, I wish you could be in this young lady's presence when she finds out, when she

gets the word that Saddam Hussein and his regime are dead and gone, that they are out of power. I wish you could be in the family room of some of these people when these families find out that the horrible monster that they have dealt with has been put down by a coalition of the willing, by some people willing to accept the responsibility that this cannot stand, that this cannot continue to go on.

I also hope, those of you that witness this, keep in mind and let your memories keep in mind those people who would not join the willing coalition, those people who stood by and said, leave him alone, we have no right.

Today, in fact, I heard a previous speaker here on the House floor a few minutes ago say that we are violating some international concept he has. In his opinion, from what I drew from his remarks, I am not quoting him, but from what I drew from his remarks, it was let it be. Kind of like the Beatle's song, "Let It Be," to let it go.

Keep in mind, those people that were willing to let this regime stand, that after 12 years of breaking resolution after resolution, after killing tens of thousands, not tens, not hundreds, not thousands, tens of thousands of his own people through poison gas, and these people stood there and talked about, well, let us have another cup of coffee and negotiate, while people like this expatriate's family suffered.

God knows how many people in that country we are going to discover have suffered horrible acts of violence. I read yesterday on the I think it was the AP wire about the shredding machine, one of the torture chambers they have. One the ways they have of torturing is a shredder. If they are kind, they put you in head first, because it kills you instantly. If they do not want to do that, they put you in feet first, so you know what happens. This kind of stuff we are going to find out.

The Sheryl Crows and the Martin Sheens and the people that are saying we are going to use the Oscar ceremonies to protest the war, I hope you are watching your TV. I hope you are paying as much attention to what Saddam Hussein has done, when the facts come out after we militarily bring down that regime, as the time you have devoted to condemning our President and our team down there on Pennsylvania Avenue, and, in fact, this United States Congress.

Responsibility, that is what it is about. Every one of us in this House was elected to accept responsibility. We have more responsibilities than the average person on the street. But the average person on the street has responsibilities. It is not an overused word. It is not an overused word.

Responsibility is a character. It is a standard of character, in my opinion. Responsibility, acceptance of the responsibility and carrying out the mission of responsibility.

I stand here with a great deal of pride, one acknowledging the responsi-

bility and the great sacrifice our American forces have made. Once again I renew my challenge to every protester, to every Congressman, to every movie star, to every singer, the Sheryl Crows and those out there. I challenge you tomorrow, or as soon as we take that action, for you to stand up and sing a song for the forces of America.

This responsibility that we carry on our shoulders, nobody ever said pulling that wagon up the hill was going to be easy. But it is our responsibility to get that wagon up the hill, and not just for the United States of America, not just for our willing coalition of 30-some countries, but for the world, for the goodness of man. There is no country in the history of the world that has represented more goodness and protected more goodness and accepted the responsibility of helping other people than the United States of America.

This Nation has nothing to apologize for, and I as a United States Congressman will never apologize for the United States of America. I stand here with pride, because I think in part we as Congressmen, although we do not carry, are not there in the field, I would like to be. I wish I were 20-some years younger. I would like to have them drop me in the center of Baghdad. I know many of my colleagues would, too.

In a small way as Congress people, and the administration in a big, big way, a lot of people in this country have stood up to the responsibility, have acknowledged it and have put that pack on their back. They are willing to help get that wagon up the hill. A few have dropped off.

When I went camping as a young man, I always used to get upset with the people that sat by the fire but never helped gather the firewood. A lot of people deserve to sit by the fire, because they have helped get the firewood. It is time for those who have not helped gather the firewood to get out there and get some firewood. Then they, too, can sit by the fire.

But we have an inherent obligation, an inherent obligation, to our generation and to the generations that follow our generation to make sure that tyrants like Saddam Hussein, to the extent that we can stop it, that we carry out the mission of our responsibility, that we carry out the mission of our duty to the United States of America, that we make the people who have fought for decades and generations under the Stars and Stripes, that we carry out our part, that our generation, too, can be spoken of in the future as one of those generations that stood when the challenge came forward and proudly took those colors and proudly took those colors to the next generation and delivered to that generation a country strong in will; a country strong in freedom; a country that represents democracy, the model of democracy; a country that is militarily strong; a country that has a good, solid justice system; a country

that has an educational system second to none; a country that has a medical system second to none. Those are big challenges.

In the next few hours we are going to see who is going to be counted, and I hope every person that is listening to me on this floor, I hope every one of us unanimously, not one dissenting vote, unanimously supports the forces of the United States of America in their mission to accept that one word, responsibility.

I hope with Godspeed that all our forces are safe. I hope with Godspeed the citizens of the United States and all of our allies, and, in fact, the whole world, can be freed of this tyrant so we can all live in at least some type of peace.

But from the bottom of my heart, I want to thank all my fellow citizens, and I want to thank those forces that are out there in the time of need and the time of danger that have stood up and accepted that responsibility.

#### WEAKNESSES IN THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from South Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about this Republican budget resolution. It is a budget that is a failed economic plan. It proposes \$1 trillion in tax cuts, and these are tax cuts in search of an economic purpose.

Fourteen months ago, President Bush proposed a \$1.3 trillion tax cut to get this economy moving, to produce jobs. Two and one-half million Americans are without work since that tax cut, four million more Americans are without health cut since that tax cut, \$1 trillion worth of corporate assets have foreclosed since that tax cut, and 2 million more Americans have moved from the middle class into poverty. That has been the economic impact and economic effect of that tax cut. Now we are offering another tax cut to have exactly the same type of economic impact. It has been a job killer, and also been leveling to the economy.

We are about to vote on a budget in the next few days or weeks. The administration is also simultaneously proposing one of the largest rebuildings of another nation to the tune of about \$90 billion request for fighting the war and for rebuilding Iraq. The administration's postwar request would build more housing, rebuild more schools, and go further in providing health care for pregnant women in Iraq than the administration budget does for America's children and America's families.

The Wall Street Journal just as recently as the other day wrote on the postwar plans for Iraq being directed by the new Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance in the Pentagon are striking in their scope and intended speed. The administration's plan to rehabilitate the Iraqi school system, for example, envisions the U.S. military forces to secure parts of Iraq and obtain the payroll lists and assess teachers' salaries for all of Iraqi schools, according to a 10-page USAID contract proposal. The contract, officials say, could total \$100 million, will cover the cost of five pilot programs for accelerated learning to be launched within 3 months and then rolled out nationwide within 10 months, nationwide being Iraq. Only one-third of the Iraqi children are now enrolled in secondary school, but within a year the contractor will have all children in Iraq back in school.

Their plan also envisions books and other necessary supplies to 4.1 million Iraqi schoolchildren, while 25,000 schools would have all they need to function at a standard level of quality. They will rebuild 25,000 schools in Iraq.

I am not against, if we have to go to war, a reconstruction budget for Iraq, but as I just listed to you what they are planning for the schools and the schoolchildren of Iraq, I want you to note that this administration's budget calls for eliminating 40 specific educational programs here at home. The Star Schools, the Better Quality Teachers Schools, technology for our schools, rural education would be eliminated. Yet we are now talking about rebuilding 25,000 schools in Iraq; 4.1 million children in Iraq would get the basic school supplies. For the record, I think Illinois' children matter as well as Iraq's children.

Again, I want to stress that I believe that Iraq should have a reconstruction budget. I just believe America should also have its reconstruction and rebuilding budget.

Take a look at what the Wall Street Journal says about health care. In health care, there will be a 100 percent guarantee to the population for maternity care. Yet Medicaid will get a \$95 billion cut here at home. Today Medicaid provides for one-third of the live births nationally, basic maternity care in this country. We will be proposing a \$95 billion cut in Medicaid, and yet 100 percent coverage of maternity care for Iraqi women.

We have 42 million Americans who work full time without health insurance. The budget proposed by the Republican Congress, not a single new dollar to cover the uninsured, which is a cancer on our health care system, yet in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, 13 million Iraqis will be guaranteed basic health care. What is the plan for the 42 million Americans that work full time without health insurance? Zip, nothing, nada. Nothing for them.

Also in the Wall Street Journal they state a reconstruction plan will have

referral hospitals functioning in 21 cities in Iraq, yet America's hospitals in our cities are facing their worst financial crisis in the last 20 years. The Women, Infants and Children Program, which provides basic health care and prenatal care, is in for a 20 percent cut.

Higher education in America, again on education, the budget underfunds Pell grants by more than \$500 million, while college costs have gone up.

In housing, recently in the Committee on Financial Services, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Martinez said that the entire budget for the administration proposes 5,000 new housing units here in America, yet, as the Wall Street Journal notes, there is a bid for 20,000 new homes to be built in Iraq. America, 5,000 new affordable housing units; Iraq, 20,000 new homes.

The LIHEAP proposal for heating for our poor, our elderly, is in for a 20 percent cut, yet we have a proposal on the books for 10 new power plants to be rebuilt in Iraq, and electricity will be restored to 75 percent of its pre-1991 level in Iraq.

□ 2030

The Army Corps of Engineers is having a cut here in America. Yet in the rebuilding plan for Iraq, it calls for the complete reconstruction of the Umm Qasr Port so that it is fully open to cargo traffic. Yet the Corps of Engineers, which is essential to America's security, America's economic growth, it produces jobs for our economy, moves goods and services, they are open for a cut.

Transportation. We will offer help to Iraq to build 3,000 miles of major roads and highways, yet the highway funding in America is cut \$6 billion over the next 10 years as proposed by the administration's budget.

Now, as I said to my good colleague from South Carolina, as I asked for this time, I am not in the business of giving my good friends on the other side political advice; but as they plan to look at this budget and vote on this budget, I want them to know that for the American people, their vote on the resolution of the reconstruction of Iraq will also be weighed equally as their vote for this budget. And in this budget our proposals to eliminate 40 education programs that are essential to our children's future and to our families' future, houses, they will not be cut; but only 5,000 new affordable units, compared to 20,000 in Iraq.

My colleagues know that some people could take this down and make it understandable to Americans in a 30-second commercial. I want them to think hard about what they are about to vote on as it relates to America, and again I want to stress my view that I am not against a reconstruction budget for Iraq. I just believe America deserves equal and, as well, the same sense of intensity and the same sense of interest.

As I started off, I talked about the economic impact that we find ourselves in here at home. But as this